

164760

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION III  
841 Chestnut Building  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

SUBJECT: Review of SI for Precision National Corporation

DATE: 9/27/88  
ORIGINAL  
Med

FROM: Bernice Pasquini, Geohydrologist  
Site Support Section (3HW26)

TO: Ken Kryszczun, Chief  
Peter Kho, SIO  
Site Investigation Section (3HW23)

SI Report Checklist - Hydrogeology

I. <u>Section 2.0, The Site</u>	Yes	No	NA
1. USGS quad indicated	✓		
2. Latitude and longitude noted	✓		
3. Discussion refers to site sketch in text	✓		
4. Proper USGS symbols indicated on site sketch	✓		
5. Site boundaries, if known, indicated on site sketch	Boundary indicated in narrative		✓
6. North arrow oriented properly on site sketch	✓		
7. Narrative and site sketch are consistent		✓	
a) Please indicate and label the Erie Lackawanna RR			
b) I don't see two buildings in the plant area. Please correct and label.			
c) Degreasing Machinery in site sketch and degreasing units in Narrative please adjust for consistency.			
d) Discuss drainage pathway in Narrative			
8. Approximate scale is provided in narrative or on site sketch	✓		

# II. Section 3.0, Environmental Setting

Yes

No

NA

## A. Water Supply

1. All sources of public water supplies described:
  - a. Groundwater

✓

ORIGINAL

- b. Surface water

✓

2. Distance from site to public water supply noted (surface water intakes and/or water supply wells) 2.5 stream miles downstream?

✓

3. Depth of water supply wells indicated

✓

4. Aquifer(s) that water supply wells draw from are described

✓

5. Approximate number of people that are provided with water from public supply wells are indicated

✓

however you should indicate number of people outside of pub. well (i.e. Glenburn, Abington, etc.)

6. Depth of domestic wells are indicated

✓

7. Aquifer(s) that domestic wells draw from are described

✓

8. Approximate number of people that are provided with water from domestic wells are indicated

✓

Is 884 Number of home or people? Ch.

9. Supporting well log information included

✓

10. 3-mile radius map contains:

- a. Location of surface water intakes

✓

- b. Location of public water supply wells

✓

AR000556

Page 2 of 6

11. Page 3-1, third paragraph, do these nine wells belong to Pennsylvania American Water Company? Is the system supplemented on a daily basis or on an as needed basis? Please clarify.
12. Page 3-2, first paragraph, when did these households receive emergency supply of water? Isn't the contamination hexavalent chromium. Indicate this in narrative.

**B. Surface Water**

Yes No NA

1. Artificial and natural surface water bodies identified (includes springs, lakes, ponds intermittent and perennial streams, etc)

ORIGINAL

Please identify the intermittent streams in the narrative

2. Distances on streams/creeks/rivers noted in stream miles

3. Drainage patterns described

4. Hydrologic and geologic aspects of wetlands discussed

5. Section 3.2, Surface Waters, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, do you mean these creeks are upstream of the unnamed tributary to Ackerly creek or in a different watershed? Please Clarify

**C. Geology**

Yes No NA

1. Formations underlying the site described

2. Other formations present within the 3-mile radius but not under the site are described with respect to:  
a. Stratigraphic relationships

- b. Location to site

3. Structural features described

Joints, and fractures shown on Plate 1 of Reference 16

4. Please provide a better copy of figure 3.1 page 3-4.

5. Page 3-3, second paragraph, Calcareous cement not content according to page 3 of Reference 11. Page 3 of 6

11. According to reference 16 page 11, last paragraph and page 12, third paragraph, 'the upper fracture zones are usually free of chemical precipitates.' And that chemical precipitates increase as depth increases within a fracture! Please adjust.

AR000557

**D. Soils**

	Yes	No	NA
1. Native soils identified via SCS reports	✓		
2. Soil map included	Provide a clearer copy of fig 32	✓	
3. Non-native soils, or disturbances to natural soils, qualitatively identified		✓	
Section 2.6 - Bentonite cap was installed over the encapsulation area on May 15, 1980			
4. Permeability of natural soils indicated	✓		
5. pH of natural soils indicated	✓		
6. Please indicate the symbol for Oguoga flaggy loam in the narrative.			

**E. Groundwater**

	Yes	No	NA
1. Uppermost aquifer underlying the site and any aquifers hydraulically connected are described	✓		
2. Aquifer characteristics of aquifer(s) described in E1			✓
3. Confining units/barriers to ground-water flow are described			✓
4. Information is consistent with:		✓	
a. Geology section	Structure: fractures, joints not mentioned in Geology section		
b. Water supply section	Precision Engineering well depths, static water level	✓	

5. Page 3-7, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, why is it expected to follow local topography

6. Range of well depths given in narrative are for the County not within site vicinity - Please clarify this.

Page 4 of 6

7. Reference 11 seems to be missing Plates which are referred to throughout the Clarks Summit Report. Please include.

8. Page 3-7, first paragraph where was the information obtained concerning the PNE well, depth of well, depth to casing, yield. I didn't see it in reference 11.

AR000558

### III. Information Sources

	Yes	No	NA
1. Proper USGS or state geologic survey reports used for <u>Geology</u> and <u>Groundwater</u> section	✓		
2. Available State database information or well survey results used to document <u>Water Supply</u> and <u>Groundwaters</u> section		✓	
3. Additional information from local, state or federal agencies appropriately used	✓		

### IV. SI form

	Yes	No	NA
<u>Part 5 III Groundwater</u>			
01. Groundwater use in vicinity = groundwater use within 3 miles of the site	✓		
04. Depth to groundwater = depth to groundwater in soils, unconfined aquifer <u>or</u> depth to top of confined aquifer	✓		
08. Sole source aquifer designated in accordance with section 1427 of SDWA			✓
09. Description of wells = description of nearest known drinking water well	✓		
10. Recharge should only be identified if it is to aquifer(s) noted in E1	✓		
11. Discharge should only be identified if it is to aquifer(s) noted in E1	✓		

Part 5 VI Environmental Information

	Yes	No	NA
01. Permeability ranges identified match those noted in the HRS		✓	
02. "Permeability of bedrock" should provide information on permeability of upper-most aquifer	✓		
05. Soil pH can be a numerical range as defined in SCS reports		✓	
13. Appropriate land use category is underlined		✓	

VI. Additional Comments: (If no additional comments write N/A)

a) Part 5, III, 02, what about the public water supply utilizing the nine wells to supplement distribution system. Targets should increase from 884 (domestic homewells).

Precision National Corporation

Section 2  
Paragraph

3rd + 4th sentence

Change to 100 comma

... VIA change clear of Baltimore or  
Services for proper disposal. 2,500  
of waste are generated and  
disposed.

4th Paragraph

Refer to the site layout. The trains  
to the damaged Trip of Achery

You say here the disposal practices are  
not the late 70's.

would you describe these disposal practices  
more?

Any other impetus to Precision's waste  
after the landfill was closed but before the disposal  
practices were terminated.

5th Paragraph

1978 isn't shortly after the early 70's

Please clarify.

Sec 13

8<sup>th</sup>

Paragraph

2nd Sentence

ORIGINAL  
Text

Change to

Source monitoring by TAF DER has identified

232 U/L 3- Chrome and 204 U/L 3- Chromium

Chrome on October 8, 1986 in a residential well

last sentence

Don't say about 10 to 13. About 10

Fluoride and Uranium/ last say 10 to 13

also when you say below standards write standards

to the text

2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph

Change to

• Soil and sediment samples from the site

showed concentrations of Chromium concentrations

1330 mg/kg are

AR000562



Sec 2.2

2nd → 3rd Paragraph

when was the remedial work done?

00000000

4th Paragraph

The Remedial work is not shown in the S-C

layout map.

5th Paragraph

When is the Foster Ave stop work drains

removed? - you said the Plant floor before - Please

clarify.

S-C layout map

- See the tie field to it.

Sec 2.4

• 5th Paragraph

Is the stop work still in operation?

-- Please clarify

If not, what happened to it?

Sec 2.5

2nd Paragraph, 1st Sentence

what's Super Ferrex?

Why is it hazardous

Please clarify.

Sec 25 2nd Paragraph, 2nd Sentence

IT'S IN addition, Harry Hooker ↑ OF PA DER

no comma

Virginia  
Hall

3rd Paragraph

What are we removing?

4th Paragraph 3rd Sentence

IT'S IN 1978, Leonardo Insalaco ↑ OF PA DER

no comma

Paragraph 7th last Sentence

did this waste water contain hexavalent Chromium?

Sec 3.1

2nd Paragraph, 4th Sentence

What is a 1/2 stream mile to the east and of

What? ~~also~~

5th Paragraph, last Sentence

IT'S Leonardo Insalaco ↑ OF PA DER

no comma

Sec 3.2 2nd Paragraph 2nd Sentence + 3rd Paragraph, last S.

IT'S Northwestward or northerly not

northerly

Sec 3.5 last two Sentences

needs to be clearer

Sec 4.0

AR000564

Page 40. The Good and

Give dates!

ORIGINAL  
10/1/11

34 34/1/11

How did they come up with the good and bad?  
Also out of the good and bad of Chromium  
Chromium is a good metal - it is hexavalent  
chromium

Also,

chrome chrome chrome

Chrome clear and with services

Sample log

- Add the depths of the mws if known under  
the Sample description.

see 5.4

Item 6

IT should be northward or northerly!!

Item 9

IT should be northwesterly or northwesterly  
not northwesterly!

Item 16

Did the resident observe the discharge recently

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION III

841 Chestnut Building  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

**SUBJECT:** Precision National Corporation  
Site Investigation Report

SEP 14 1988

**FROM:** Dawn A. Ioven, Toxicologist  
Site Support Section (3HW26)

**TO:** Jim McCreary, SIO  
Peter Kho, SIO  
Site Investigation Section (3HW23)

The Toxicological Evaluation presented in this Site Inspection Report is clear, thorough, and very well-written. The contaminants detected in the soil and aqueous samples collected at this facility are discussed in the Evaluation in an accurate and scientifically astute manner. Additionally, potential toxicologic impacts on human health and on the environment are broached with clarity and precision. It is suggested, however, that the following comments be reviewed:

There are a few minor reporting errors on page 8-2. In the first paragraph, it is reported that HW-2 contained 58 ug/l of chromium and that 26 ug/l of chromium were observed in HW-3. However, according to the Sample Data Summary, it was the duplicate sample from HW-1 that contained chromium at 58 ug/l, while 26 ug/l were observed in HW-2. Chromium was not detected in HW-3. In the final paragraph on page 8-2, the results reported for HW-2 are actually those for the HW-1 duplicate and the results presented for HW-3 are those for HW-2. The final report should be corrected prior to final issuance.

AR000567